

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7
8 SENTINEL GLOBAL PRODUCT
9 SOLUTIONS, INC.,

No. C -13-05432(EDL)

10 Plaintiff,

ORDER REMANDING CASE

11 v.

12 HYDROFARM, INC. ET AL,

13 Defendants.
14 _____ /

15 On August 23, 2013, Plaintiff filed suit against Defendants in the Superior Court of Sonoma
16 County. Defendants removed the case on the basis of federal question jurisdiction. Plaintiff then
17 filed an amended complaint that alleged stated law claims only and asked this Court to sua sponte
18 remand the case. The Court ordered Defendants to show cause by January 28, 2014, why the Court
19 should not remand the case. Defendants did not respond to the Court's order.

20 When considering whether to retain supplemental jurisdiction, courts consider "economy,
21 convenience, fairness, and comity." Acri v. Varian Assocs., 114 F.3d 999, 1001 (9th Cir. 1997). "In
22 the usual case in which all federal-law claims are eliminated before trial, the balance of factors to be
23 considered under the pendent jurisdiction doctrine – judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and
24 comity – will point toward declining to exercise jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims."
25 Sanford v. MemberWorks, Inc., 625 F.3d 550, 561 (9th Cir. 2010) (quoting Carnegie-Mellon Univ.
26 v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 n.7 (1988)). Given the procedural posture of this case, these factors all
27 weigh in favor of remand. The Court therefore remands this case to the Superior Court of Sonoma
28 County. The Court notes that the parties have stipulated that each Defendant shall have thirty days
from the date of this order to respond to the first amended complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: February 11, 2014

Elijah D. Laporte

ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Chief Magistrate Judge